

### **Remarks**

This communication is considered fully responsive to the non-final Office Action mailed October 23, 2006 and made Final (the "Final Office Action"). Claims 1-28 were examined. Claims 1-28 stand rejected. Claims 1, 2, 13, and 21 are amended. No claims are canceled. No new claims are added. Reexamination and reconsideration of the currently pending claims are respectfully requested.

### **Interview Summary**

Applicant appreciates the telephone interview Examiner Lin accorded Applicant's attorney, Mark Trenner (hereinafter, "Mr. Trenner") on January 4, 2007. During the telephone interview, Mr. Trenner explained that the primary reference relied on in the Final Office Action (i.e., the Baker reference) is directed to different art than that which is claimed by Applicant.

Specifically, Applicant explained that Baker is directed to restricting access to information in a local area network using a software component with a specific purpose of managing access rights to public information for each user terminal. The access rights can only be modified by an authorized manager. See, e.g., Baker at col.1, lines 14-16, col.3, lines 8-15, 21-32, and 62-67, col 7, lines 1-16.

In contrast, Applicant's invention is directed toward an active information model wherein the system starts with a simple model and improves over time to reflect more sophisticated needs of an individual, e.g., as explained on page 34, line 25 to page 35, line 6.

Mr. Trenner also explained that the relation in claim 1 characterizes the relationship between elements of a data source, the association declares a relationship exists between two or more elements of the data source, and the rule embodies the association, e.g., as explained on page 42, line 17 to page 43 line 31.

The Examiner said that he understood the distinction and said that clarifying amendments in this regard would likely overcome the rejections with regard to Baker. The Examiner requested that Applicant file an RCE so that he could do a new search.

#### **No New Matter**

No new matter is introduced by the amendments. Support for the amendments is found in the specification as originally filed, e.g., on page 34, line 25 to page 35, line 6; and on page 42, line 16 to page 43, line 31.

#### **Claim Rejections**

Applicant believes that all claim rejections in the Final Office Action are moot in view of the amendments and for the reasons discussed with Examiner Lin during the telephone interview on January 4, 2007, as summarized above.

Applicant reserves the right to present further argument if any rejections are maintained in view of the amendments. Applicant hereby incorporates by reference all of the arguments previously presented in the Response to the first Office Action, filed on August 14, 2006. Applicant maintains that the claim

recitations are not taught or suggested by the cited references for at least these reasons.

**Conclusion**

The Applicant respectfully requests that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this matter. If there are any matters that may be clarified by telephone, the Examiner is encouraged to call Applicant's attorney at the number listed below.

Respectfully Submitted,



Dated: January 22, 2007

By: \_\_\_\_\_

Mark D. Trenner  
Reg. No. 43,961  
(720) 221-3708